DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 415 790 HE 030 936

AUTHOR	Stoddard, Eve W.
TITLE	Cultural Encounters at St. Lawrence University. Final FIPSE Report.
INSTITUTION	Saint Lawrence Univ., Canton, NY.
SPONS AGENCY	Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	1995-08-31
NOTE	33p.; Portions printed on colored paper.
CONTRACT	P116B21371
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	College Faculty; College Students; Consciousness Raising; *Cross Cultural Training; *Cultural Awareness; Cultural Interrelationships; Curriculum Development; Curriculum Enrichment; *Faculty Development; Foreign Countries; Foreign Culture; Higher Education; *Inservice Teacher Education; Intercultural Communication; *International Programs; *Multicultural Education; Simulation; Study Abroad; Workshops
IDENTIFIERS	India; Kenya; Saint Lawrence University NY

ABSTRACT

This final report of a three-year project at Saint Lawrence University (NY), entitled the Cultural Encounters Project, details a faculty and curriculum development project that focused on particular issues in global or international studies. The project grew out of the so-called "cultural wars," or clash between those who sought to retain an exclusive focus on western civilization and those who sought inclusion of nonwestern and multicultural topics in the curriculum. This faculty seminar was initially planned to continue for 2 years; it included field study in Kenya and India and focused on developing a model of studying and representing cultures through their patterns of interaction and change over time. The seminar proved so successful that it was continued for a third year, and is projected to continue for another year. A total of 25 faculty members have participated over the three years of the program, during which 12 cultural encounters courses were created and taught. The program is also being offered on a pilot basis to three entering classes of student as an alternative general education track. Sample curricular guidelines and course descriptions are appended. (JLS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

HE

ED 415 790

Cover Sheet

CULTURAL ENCOUNTERS AT ST. LAWRENCE UNIVERSITY.

Grantee Organization:

St. Lawrence University
Canton, New York 13617

Grant Number:

P116B21371

Project Dates:

Starting Date: September 1, 1992
Ending Date: August 31, 1995
Number of Months: 36

Project Director:

Eve W. Stoddard
Associate Professor of English and Director of International Education
St. Lawrence University
Canton, New York 13617
Telephone: (315) 379-5992

FIPSE Program Officer:

Eulalia Cobb

Grant Award:

Year 1	$90,340
Year 2	$90,340
Year 3	$57,242
Total	$237,922

HE 030 936

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FINAL FIPSE REPORT:
CULTURAL ENCOUNTERS AT ST. LAWRENCE UNIVERSITY

Project Summary: The Cultural Encounters Project was a three-year faculty and curriculum development project focused on particular issues in global or international studies. It grew out of the "culture wars" in the academy, the clash betwee those who wanted to retain an exclusive focus on western civilization and those who wanted to make room in the curriculum for non-western and multicultural topics. The faculty seminar was intended to run for two years and included field study in Kenya and India. The seminar proved so successful that it continued with an influx of new participants in the third year and will continue again in the fourth. The seminar has focused on developing a model of studying and representing cultures through how they interact and change over time. It has rejected a monocultural focus as it has rejected the polarization and opposition of western and non-western cultures. In the third year the faculty at St. Lawrence voted overwhelmingly to implement the new Cultural Encounters alternative general education track on a pilot basis for three entering classes. During the three years of the grant, twelve new Cultural Encounters courses were created and taught. Seventeen faculty members participated for the entire three years and eight new people joined in Year Three.

Eve W. Stoddard
Director of International Education and Associate Professor of English
St. Lawrence University
Canton, NY 13617
(315) 379-5991

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Executive Summary:
Cultural Encounters at St. Lawrence University

St. Lawrence University
Canton, NY 13617
Eve Stoddard, Project Director
International Education
(315) 379-5991

Project Overview:

The Cultural Encounters Project was a three-year faculty and curriculum development project focused on particular issues in global or international studies. It grew out of the "culture wars" in the academy, the clash betwee those who wanted to retain an exclusive focus on western civilization and those who wanted to make room in the curriculum for non-western and multicultural topics.The faculty seminar was intended to run for two years and included field study in Kenya and India. The seminar proved so successful that it continued with an influx of new participants in the third year and will continue again in the fourth. The seminar has focused on developing a model of studying and representing cultures through how they interact and change over time. It has rejected a monocultural focus as it has rejected the polarization and opposition of western and non-western cultures. In the third year of the grant, St. Lawrence co-sponsored with AAC&U a national institute on Cultural Encounters in New Orleans. About 220 people participated. In the third year the faculty at St. Lawrence voted overwhelmingly to implement the new Cultural Encounters alternative general education track on a pilot basis for three entering classes. During the three years of the grant, twelve new Cultural Encounters courses were created and taught. Seventeen faculty members participated for the entire three years and eight new people joined in Year Three.

Purpose:

Our project was designed to develop a general education curriculum that would bring a sophisticated, multi-faceted globalism to the curriculum. St. Lawrence is a small, traditional liberal arts college in a rural setting with a predominantly white student body and an almost exclusively white faculty. One third of our students study abroad for at least a semester; we have long been recognized for excellent abroad programs. We recognized the fact that our students were going to live and work in a transnational world and a multicultural society, and that one third our students chose to study abroad, but were lacking an effective academic context for their international experiences. We wanted to develop a curriculum which asked students to look critically at the categories of west and non-west, of self and other, and of culture itself. We wanted students to see their own cultural traditions in a global context. We also wanted to expose them to a variety of beliefs and practices, but we were not content with the facile cultural relativism pervading traditional studies of cultures outside the west.

We also wanted to develop a new vision of general education that would be more coherent than the cafeteria-style distribution system we have had for decades, including writing-intensive courses, a foreign language requirement, and an integrative senior seminar.

Background and Origins:

The immediate pre-cursor of the Cultural Encounters Project was the Cultural Legacies Project sponsored by the Association of American Colleges.We felt there was a need to look at both the sophomore and senior years, to provide follow up from the First-Year Program and then to provide some kind of capstone experience. On our campus, we felt a need to "internationalize the curriculum." Once we got the grant, the project was presented at a faculty forum and was perceived by people to be a major commitment of their time and energy for a three year period. The expectations were that faculty would participate in the reading seminar every three weeks, for a week in January, a week in May, and then travel for a month for each of the first two summers. They would be obligated to develop a new course. The sixteen original faculty represented eleven disciplines, three area studies programs, environmental studies, and gender studies.

Project Description:

The main features of the Cultural Encounters Project were a two-year faculty development seminar including field study and bringing speakers to campus, development of new courses comprised of both western and non-western subject matter, dissemination through a national conference and production of anthologies, and ultimately the institution of a new, alternative core curriculum. In addition to developing an intellectual model for our courses, we had to develop a common discourse about pedagogy and what writing-intensive means. We had sixteen faculty for the first two years and then eight new faculty joined the third year.

The first summer we traveled to Kenya for a month where we stayed with families in three different areas, met with scholars, visited rural schools and clinics, and generally experienced the cultural diversity within Kenya and the social and economic and political issues facing it. We kept journals on the trip and wrote essays afterward, which we shared and critiqued in a daylong meeting at the end of summer. The second year we read post-modern theory and it caused some serious tension in the group. We tried to work with science, but had great difficulties satisfying the two scientists that we were doing so. In the second year four new courses were piloted. Two faculty were asked by AAC&U to run a national institute on the Cultural Legacies Project. This proved to be a pilot for the national conference we were going to run in our third year to disseminate our work.

In the second summer we did field study in India for a month. We learned a great deal by the contrasts between the two field study trips. One was the value of homestays and of having a base which could provide stability as we traveled around the country. Allowing individuals to pursue their own areas of interest also makes for a more effective trip. But the many contrasts between Kenya and India, even with regard to their choices as post-British colonies, were extremely instructive. The two countries have pursued radically different economic policies and strategies since independence. It was extremely valuable for us to see how multiculturalism plays out in both countries, and in comparison to the U.S., to look at gender issues, family structures, and changes therein as the societies become urbanized and "modernized."

In year three we brought eight new faculty into the seminar and really turned over the reading list to them. They were mostly social scientists and they mediated the polarities that had earlier developed between humanist/post-modernists and hard-headed empiricists. We turned our attention more to course development and pedagogy. We decided to take the alternative core curriculum proposal forward to the faculty much earlier than we had anticipated and it passed. Eight new courses were offered in the second year, including the first senior seminar. We put on a national conference, co-sponsored by AAC&U in New Orleans in March. Anthologies of readings have been developed for both conferences, but we have as yet not moved toward actual publication of them. That work needs yet to be done. There has been considerable dissemination of the project at national conferences and through an article by Eve Stoddard and Grant Cornwell, published in Liberal Education in fall 1994. Other members have presented and published on work they have done as part of the Cultural Encounters Project.

Evaluation/Project Results:

In the strictest sense of outcomes assessment, we have not yet completed an evaluation of the Cultural Encounters Project. We have collected large amounts of evaluation data along the way, but we are still planning to bring in an outside evaluator to bring it all together. Students are only now beginning to benefit from it. We did mount twelve pilot courses, and we do have evaluations from them which are particularly geared toward the goals of Cultural Encounters. But the most direct outcomes of the project per se are the changes in the faculty who participated, the new ways of thinking they have developed, the new courses they are offering, and the new curriculum we have put in place for students. There is no question that the participants have changed significantly as a result of the project and that departmental offerings have become more global than they were before. But the changes are far greater than these direct outcomes; the institution has changed.

The International Education Committee, populated mostly with faculty from Cultural Encounters, has developed a new European Studies minor, directly informed and served by Cultural Encounters ideas. In light of what we learned in Cultural Encounters we have initiated a new internship course in our European abroad programs which uses readings on cultural interaction as a conceptual framework for internships. We have gotten a new half million dollar grant from the Christian Johnson Endeavor Foundation to further develop Cultural Encounters and develop a related program in American multiculturalism.

One of the unanticipated outcomes has been the institutionalization of a strong culture of faculty development at St. Lawrence. Faculty do not want to let go of the Cultural Encounters seminar. Since its inception there have been shorter term seminars on multiculturalism, teaching writing, and service learning. This year there is one on gender studies that is modeled very closely on the Cultural Encounters structure.

As far as dissemination is concerned, we have been prolific. We have organized at two national institutes; there were over 300 at the first and about 220 at the second. There have been numerous conference presentations on the Cultural Encounters Project and on work that has emanated from it; at least four articles have been published as a direct result of it. Two consulting invitations have resulted from it and many requests for information on the readings for the faculty seminar and the courses resulting from it. We expect this kind of activity to continue.

The next step is most immediately to get the new Cultural Encounters Alternative Distribution Track up and running. We are in the process of signing up students right now. We have had to put all kinds of new mechanisms in place for student recruitment and course approval. Now we have to make it all work.

The next faculty/curriculum development project is the Christian Johnson Endeavor Foundation Grant in Intercultural Studies. This will fund the continuation of the Cultural Encounters seminar and a field study trip to the Caribbean for a largely new group of faculty. It will fund the development of a program in American Pluralism which we hope will be linked to global diversity along the model of the Cultural Encounters courses. And it will fund a number of shorter faculty seminars on a series of themes designed to create interconnections among many different programs on and off campus.

Summary and Conclusions:

The major insight offered by our project is that serious, sustained intellectual work, perhaps like "pure research," may in the end offer more productivity than activity directed at concrete pre-designed goals. Also, faculty viewed our project as a major commitment of time so much that they really engaged in it and the majority are changed thinkers and teachers as a result. It was extremely difficult in the beginning, due to opposition from within and without, but in the end perseverance paid off. We found that as time went on people who opposed our project just got used to it so that it no longer seemed to be an interloper, but in our institution that has a lot to do with its being an alternative rather than required program.Working among people of different disciplines is tough going, but terribly fruitful in the end. Getting scientists involved in questions of cultural diversity remains a serious challenge, not just at St. Lawrence but nationally, but ecology and health seem to be two ways to do it. Postmodernism makes people who don't like it absolutely furious and is probably not productive except in limited doses. The arts are a great way to study questions of diversity and to bring people together across disciplines.

Getting faculty who are not used to anything but departmental autonomy to cooperate in designing curricular guidelines and then submitting to them is also challenging. It is best to be flexible and allow people to come along gradually. It has been our experience that with a few exceptions, the more faculty teach in a program the more willing they are to think as part of the program.

Finally, there has to be administrative support for junior faculty to gain recognition for serious faculty development work. They are diverting time away from traditional research for the good of the institution and this has to be recognized as more than service or even teaching. They have to be supported sometimes against department chairs who prefer to keep them sequestered in the service of the department.

Appendix I: FIPSE's Role:

I think that simply getting feedback and validation from the Program Officer is extremely valuable. One feels a bit overwhelmed by the responsibility of receiving money from the federal government and the weight of all the rules and regulations. The biggest area in which we needed help was assessment. The Project Directors meetings were very helpful on this topic, particularly the cluster meeting with Dora Marcus I attended my first year. There I got ideas about qualitative evaluation and hence used meeting minutes and essays by faculty in the project as evaluative evidence rather than thinking I had to have statistical evidence.

Our project comes under several headings: faculty development, cultural diversity, and general education. I think we may have been unusual in that we were trying to design something entirely new from the ground up, so FIPSE was funding basic intellectual study of a new curricular area. It was a great opportunity for faculty to grow and change. FIPSE gave us the time to take seriously new areas of inquiry.

Final Report:
Cultural Encounters at St. Lawrence University

Project Overview:

The Cultural Encounters Project was a three-year faculty and curriculum development project focused on particular issues in global or international studies. It grew out of the "culture wars" in the academy, the clash betwee those who wanted to retain an exclusive focus on western civilization and those who wanted to make room in the curriculum for non-western and multicultural topics. It grew out of our participation in the Association of American Colleges' Cultural Legacies Project. We wanted to continue what we had begun with that in a much more systematic way. Both ventures grew out of our desire to build on the curriculum reform effort initiated with our First-Year Program, especially to create a focus for the sophomore and senior years. The faculty seminar was intended to run for two years and included field study in Kenya and India. The seminar proved so successful that it continued with an influx of new participants in the third year and will continue again in the fourth. The seminar has focused on developing a model of studying and representing cultures through how they interact and change over time. It has rejected a monocultural focus as it has rejected the polarization and opposition of western and non-western cultures. In the third year of the grant, St. Lawrence co-sponsored with AAC&U a national institute on Cultural Encounters in New Orleans. About 220 people participated. In the third year the faculty at St. Lawrence voted overwhelmingly to implement the new Cultural Encounters alternative general education track on a pilot basis for three entering classes. During the three years of the grant, twelve new Cultural Encounters courses were created and taught. Seventeen faculty members participated for the entire three years and eight new people joined in Year Three.

Purpose:

Our project was designed to develop a general education curriculum that would bring a sophisticated, multi-faceted globalism to the curriculum. St. Lawrence is a small, traditional liberal arts college in a rural setting with a predominantly white student body and an almost exclusively white faculty. One third of our students study abroad for at least a semester; we have long been recognized for excellent abroad programs. We have area studies in Africa, Asia, Caribbean and Latin America, and Canada. These programs serve small numbers of students except that they offer courses to fulfill a graduation requirement in Non-Western and Third World Studies. We have traditionally not had any mandatory requirements until the First-Year Program began in 1988. About two thirds of our 155 faculty are sympathetic to curriculum reform and innovation, but about one third are vehemently opposed. There have been deep divisions among the faculty over this since the inception of the FYP.

We recognized the fact that our students were going to live and work in a transnational world and a multicultural society, and that one third our students chose to

study abroad, but were lacking an effective academic context for their international experiences. The faculty who developed the intellectual basis for the project were not happy with the national "culture wars" which set the canons of western culture against those of other cultures. We wanted to develop a curriculum which asked students to look critically at the categories of west and non-west, of self and other, and of culture itself. We wanted students to see their own cultural traditions in a global context. We also wanted to expose them to a variety of beliefs and practices, but we were not content with the facile cultural relativism pervading traditional studies of cultures outside the west. We felt that we needed, not to hire more experts trained in various area studies, but to evolve our own new vision of cultural interaction, one that drew from many cultures, but resisted reifying or sanctifying any of them.

We also wanted to develop a new vision of general education that would be more coherent than the cafeteria-style distribution system we have had for decades. We wanted to offer writing-intensive courses in this new curriculum, to have a foreign language requirement, and to offer an integrative senior seminar. Although the Cultural Encounters Program was never intended to be a mandatory general education system for the entire student body, we hoped it would offer a model to help the faculty rethink the existing system.

Background and Origins:

The immediate pre-cursor of the Cultural Encounters Project was the Cultural Legacies Project sponsored by the Association of American Colleges, which we joined in 1990, at the suggestion of our President, Patti McGill Peterson, who was then on the Board of AAC. But the impetus for participation in that project came from faculty in our First-Year Program (FYP), an extremely challenging and innovative curriculum reform project begun in 1987. Many faculty felt that we had only begun to do what was needed in the area of general education at St. Lawrence(SLU) by instituting this team-taught, multidisciplinary, residentially based course for first-year students. We felt there was a need to look at both the sophomore and senior years, to provide follow up from the FYP and then to provide some kind of capstone experience. Cultural Legacies was a faculty reading seminar, largely in post-modern writing, which resulted in one sophomore-level course and three senior seminars being taught. We used the experiences of that project as a basis for our FIPSE grant application. One of the lessons we learned from the Cultural Legacies Seminar was that if we wanted faculty to make a serious commitment to rigorous, sustained intellectual work, we had to pay them enough to make them feel that the seminar was one of their major obligations, like teaching a course, not something that would get pushed aside every time there was another deadline. We were fortunate at the time we wrote the grant proposal to have an excellent person working in our Development Office in the area of corporate and foundation grants. She worked with a committee of six faculty members in thinking through what we wanted to accomplish, where we should look for money, and how to write the proposal. She was invaluable in helping with the budget proposal.

Our original committee included faculty from English, Philosophy, and Government as well as three area studies programs: Asian Studies, African Studies, and Caribbean and Latin American Studies. Two of the members had extensive experience in general education reform, four had been pilot members of the First-Year Program, and all

had been involved in Cultural Legacies. Our project was shaped by national controversies over core curricula, whether they should be exclusively western or broadened to include global and multicultural perspectives. Many of us on the committee were interested in postmodern critiques of the Enlightenment and in dilemmas surrounding development questions in the Third World. Locally, on our campus, we felt a need to "internationalize the curriculum," and to provide some kind of academic preparation and follow-up for the 33% of our students who spend at least a semester abroad.

Although the President and Academic Vice President/ Dean of the Faculty were supportive of the general direction of the Cultural Encounters proposal, they were also leary of the potential political conflicts which it might provoke within the faculty. The First-Year Program, along with increasing fiscal constraints, had caused serious animosity among the faculty. The sides had shaped up as those who supported interdisciplinary initiatives and innovation against those who believed our strength should remain in traditional discipline-based departments. Increasingly staffing decisions were being made by the Dean in favor of supporting interdisciplinary programs. The FYP became the scapegoat for these tensions. Since the people on the Cultural Encounters committee were also the leadership of the FYP, there was bound to be antagonism toward the new project.

The committee decided to try to be as above-board as possible and submitted the grant proposal to the Academic Affairs Committee (the committee which approves new courses and programs) for its imprimatur. One of the members circulated the proposal to department chairs as evidence of the terrible things happening via the administration. The Academic Affairs Committee ended up refusing to vote on the proposal as out of their domain. The administration decided to support it anyway. The Andrew Mellon Foundation, who had given us a grant for the FYP, agreed to give us $150,000 for Cultural Encounters if we received funding from FIPSE. This paid, among other things, for the travel to Kenya and India.

Once we got the grant, we had to select the faculty who would participate. A committee of faculty from across the curriculum was chosen to select people. The Project Director and one other original committee member was on it, but the others were people who could not join the project because of other commitments. It was agreed that even the co-authors of the grant would apply like everyone else. They were all chosen, but one ended up leaving SLU before we got started, and another left after one year. The project was presented at a faculty forum and was perceived by people to be a major commitment of their time and energy for a three year period. The expectations were that faculty would participate in the reading seminar every three weeks, for a week in January, a week in May, and then travel for a month for each of the first two summers. They would be obligated to develop and teach a new course for Cultural Encounters. Faculty saw this as a huge demand on their time which would effectively limit their ability to do their normal scholarship. Nonetheless we received thirty-three applications out of a total of 155 faculty. The criteria for selection were diversity of disciplines and areas, quality of proposal, past scholarly productivity, and demonstrated concern about curricular and pedagogical innovation. Although everyone had to meet these criteria, in fact people signed up with varying agendas of their own. Some were especially interested in the field study, some in reading and discussing ideas, and some in curriculum development. It took two years to bring everyone to a common commitment to curriculum development. And despite our

efforts to make the selection process as fair as possible, there were a number of hurt and angry faculty who were not chosen. We accepted nineteen, expecting that there would be attrition, which there was. We ended the first year with our target number of sixteen faculty. They represented eleven disciplines, three area studies programs, environmental studies, and gender studies.

The first year of the faculty seminar was fraught with tension as people tried to establish a common vision of the project. It was challenging to balance open inquiry and criticism against the parameters set forth in the initial proposal. We have followed the conceptual basis of the curriculum in the original proposal but our reading list for the seminar took its own course after the first year. We found that retreats and the field study in Kenya were the glue that brought the group together. We did an initial overnight retreat at a conference facility in January which definitely warmed relations among the faculty in the group. Then in the week before we traveled to Kenya the first summer we spent a week of intensive full-time meetings that were extremely unifying and productive. And by the end of the Kenya trip there was a new sense of commitment and group identity among the faculty in the project.

Project Description:

The main features of the Cultural Encounters Project were a two-year faculty development seminar including field study and bringing speakers to campus, development of new courses comprised of both western and non-western subject matter, dissemination through a national conference and production of anthologies, and ultimately the institution of a new, alternative core curriculum. The project was huge. It involved getting faculty from many different disciplines together every two weeks to discuss readings ranging from African oral epic to contemporary scholars on western science and development issues to post-modern ethnographic theory to a Chilean novel to Columbus' journals. In addition to developing an intellectual model for our courses, we had to develop a common discourse about pedagogy and what writing-intensive means. We had sixteen faculty for the first two years and then eight new faculty joined the third year.

The first summer we traveled to Kenya for a month where we stayed with families in three different areas, met with scholars, visited rural schools and clinics, and generally experienced the cultural diversity within Kenya and the social and economic and political issues facing it. We kept journals on the trip and wrote essays afterward, which we shared and critiqued in a daylong meeting at the end of summer. Thus we put ourselves through experiences similar to those of our students in order to try to grasp what would be most valuable in the way of coursework to prepare them for going abroad and a seminar to help them reflect critically on their experiences upon their return.

After the first year we decided that we needed a way to bridge the gap between the initiated and the uninitiated on any particular seminar reading or topic. We began a system of appointing one person with expertise and one totally lacking in it to run the discussions.

This proved quite effective. The second year we read a lot of post-modern theory and it caused some serious tension in the group. We tried to work with science, but had great difficulties satisfying the two scientists that we were doing so. In the second year four new courses were piloted. Two faculty were asked by AAC to run a national institute on the Cultural Legacies Project. This proved to be a pilot for the national conference we were going to run in our third year to disseminate our work.

In the second summer we did field study in India for a month. This was not the bonding experience that Kenya had been. We learned a great deal by the contrasts between the two field study trips. One was the value of homestays and of having a base which could provide stability as we traveled around the country. Another was that too much travel is self-defeating. The more we were treated like tourists the less we benefited and the grouchier we got. Longer immersion in fewer places is more effective. Allowing individuals to pursue their own areas of interest also makes for a more effective trip. But the many contrasts between Kenya and India, even with regard to their choices as post-British colonies, were extremely instructive. The two countries have pursued radically different economic policies and strategies since independence. It was extremely valuable for us to see how multiculturalism plays out in both countries, and in comparison to the U.S., to look at gender issues, family structures, and changes therein as the societies become urbanized and "modernized."

In year three we brought eight new faculty into the seminar and really turned over the reading list to them. They were mostly social scientists and they mediated the polarities that had earlier developed between humanist/post-modernists and hard-headed empiricists. We turned our attention more to course development and pedagogy. We decided to take the alternative core curriculum proposal forward to the faculty much earlier than we had anticipated and it passed. Eight new courses were offered in the second year, including the first senior seminar. We put on a national conference, co-sponsored by AAC&U in New Orleans in March. Anthologies of readings have been developed for both conferences, but we have as yet not moved toward actual publication of them. That work needs yet to be done. There has been considerable dissemination of the project at national conferences and through an article by Eve Stoddard and Grant Cornwell, published in Liberal Education in fall 1994. Other members have presented and published on work they have done as part of the Cultural Encounters Project.

Evaluation/Project Results:

In the strictest sense of outcomes assessment, we have not yet completed an evaluation of the Cultural Encounters Project. We have collected large amounts of evaluation data along the way, but we are still planning to bring in an outside evaluator to bring it all together. Our concrete outcomes are the new courses and the institutionalized program we have brought into being. In a more generous sense, we have succeeded so far in changing the intellectual paradigm of how one studies cultures at St. Lawrence that the "cultural encounters" model now seems normal and taken for granted, even by many faculty who were not a part of the project. It is hard for us to measure learning outcomes for students at this point because this was primarily a faculty and curriculum development project. Students are only now beginning to benefit from it. We did mount twelve pilot courses, and we do have evaluations from them which are particularly geared toward the goals of Cultural Encounters. But the most direct outcomes of the project per se are the

changes in the faculty who participated, the new ways of thinking they have developed, the new courses they are offering, and the new curriculum we have put in place for students. There is no question that the participants have changed significantly as a result of the project and that departmental offerings have become more global than they were before. But the changes are far greater than these direct outcomes; the institution has changed.

For years the administration hoped that the Director of International Education would develop some kind of international curriculum. The Director is a faculty member who serves for three years and then goes back to the faculty. He or she supervises thirteen abroad programs, international students, and area studies programs, heretofore with the help of a secretary and part-time international student advisor. The administration got excited enough about Cultural Encounters to put the Project Director into the Directorship of International Education and finally to add an Assistant Director to manage the daily workings of the programs. This freed the Director to attend to curriculum development. The International Education Committee, populated mostly with faculty from Cultural Encounters, has developed a new European Studies minor, directly informed and served by Cultural Encounters ideas. In light of what we learned in Cultural Encounters we have initiated a new internship course in our European abroad programs which uses readings on cultural interaction as a conceptual framework for internships which hitherto tended to fall into vocational preparation rather than the cultural immersion they were designed to be. A history professor who was not part of our project is reconceptualizing the western civilization sequence to fit a cultural encounters model, focusing in the second semester on encounters between Islam and the West. He is also setting up a course on Nationalism and Ethnicity, focusing on the former Yugoslavia, which uses a cultural encounters paradigm. We are moving toward a foreign language requirement for the entire college. We have gotten a new half million dollar grant from the Christian Johnson Endeavor Foundation to further develop Cultural Encounters and develop a related program in American multiculturalism.

The fact that our new alternative general education program passed means that the University-wide Academic Affairs Committee has to scrutinize all our courses to approve them for Cultural Encounters credit. This in itself is a project in continuing education because the members of the committee have to understand our fairly theoretical guidelines in order to ascertain whether the courses meet them. They also have to determine whether the courses are "writing-intensive" in the absence thus far of any university-wide standards of what this means. Actually the need created by this situation has pushed the University Writing Committee to produce written guidelines on what "writing-intensive" means. Thus there are ongoing ripples of influence from this one faculty development project which could never have been predicted or foreseen.

When we assessed our First-Year Program in 1990-91, we found that faculty development in new pedagogies and in interdisciplinary inquiry had been one of the unanticipated benefits of the program. The Cultural Encounters Project put faculty development at its center, but one of its unanticipated outcomes has been the establishment of a strong culture of faculty development at St. Lawrence. Faculty do not want to let go of the Cultural Encounters seminar. Since its inception there have been shorter term seminars on multiculturalism, teaching writing, and service learning. This year

there is one on gender studies that is modeled very closely on the Cultural Encounters structure. There is a core of faculty who participate in a number of these, but each one draws in new people from the fringes, and each time a fairly conservative, traditional faculty member participates, there are ripples to others who might not have thought about joining.

As far as dissemination is concerned, we have been prolific. We have organized at two national institutes; there were over 300 at the first and about 220 at the second. There have been numerous conference presentations on the Cultural Encounters Project and on work that has emanated from it; at least four articles have been published as a direct result of it. Two consulting invitations have resulted from it and many requests for information on the readings for the faculty seminar and the courses resulting from it. We expect this kind of activity to continue.

The next step is most immediately to get the new Cultural Encounters Alternative Distribution Track up and running. We are in the process of signing up students right now. We have had to put all kinds of new mechanisms in place for student recruitment and course approval. Now we have to make it all work.

The next faculty/curriculum development project is the Christian Johnson Endeavor Foundation Grant in Intercultural Studies. This will fund the continuation of the Cultural Encounters seminar and a field study trip to the Caribbean for a largely new group of faculty. It will fund the development of a program in American Pluralism which we hope will be linked to global diversity along the model of the Cultural Encounters courses. And it will fund a number of shorter faculty seminars on a series of themes designed to create interconnections among many different programs on and off campus.

Summary and Conclusions:

The major insight offered by our project is that serious, sustained intellectual work, perhaps like "pure research," may in the end offer more productivity than activity directed at concrete pre-designed goals. Also, faculty viewed our project as a major commitment of time so much that they really engaged in it and the majority are changed thinkers and teachers as a result. It was extremely difficult in the beginning, due to opposition from within and without, but in the end perseverance paid off. We found that as time went on people who opposed our project just got used to it so that it no longer seemed to be an interloper, but in our institution that has a lot to do with its being an alternative rather than required program.Working among people of different disciplines is tough going, but terribly fruitful in the end. Getting scientists involved in questions of cultural diversity remains a serious challenge, not just at St. Lawrence but nationally, but ecology and health seem to be two ways to do it. Postmodernism makes people who don't like it absolutely furious and is probably not productive except in limited doses. The arts are a great way to study questions of diversity and to bring people together across disciplines.

Getting faculty who are not used to anything but departmental autonomy to cooperate in designing curricular guidelines and then submitting to them is also challenging. It is best to be flexible and allow people to come along gradually. It has been our experience that with a few exceptions, the more faculty teach in a program the more willing they are to think as part of the program.

Finally, there has to be administrative support for junior faculty to gain recognition for serious faculty development work. They are diverting time away from traditional research for the good of the institution and this has to be recognized as more than service or even teaching. They have to be supported sometimes against department chairs who prefer to keep them sequestered in the service of the department.

Appendices:

Appendix I: FIPSE's Role:

I think that simply getting feedback and validation from the Program Officer is extremely valuable. One feels a bit overwhelmed by the responsibility of receiving money from the federal government and the weight of all the rules and regulations. It is important to have someone say what you are doing is okay with the agency and to feel comfortable to be able to call and ask questions. I felt less welcome to do this with our initial Program Officer than with Eulalia Cobb who was just terrific.

The biggest area in which we needed help was (and is) assessment. The Project Directors meetings were very helpful on this topic, particularly the cluster meeting with Dora Marcus I attended my first year. There I got ideas about qualitative evaluation and hence used meeting minutes and essays by faculty in the project as evaluative evidence rather than thinking I had to have statistical evidence. The Project Directors' meetings have the potential to be really helpful, but it is not always easy to connect with the right projects. FIPSE funds such a diverse group of schools and projects that one tends to feel too different sometimes. I think cluster meetings and then substantive sessions not so directly related to projects are good. But assessment will always be essential.

Our project comes under several headings: faculty development, cultural diversity, and general education. I think we may have been unusual in that we were trying to design something entirely new from the ground up, so FIPSE was funding basic intellectual study of a new curricular area. It was a great opportunity for faculty who were narrowly trained to grow and change. For example at least eight faculty who were traditional scholars in the European or American humanities are now incorporating major consideration of the third world in their courses. These people will never be the same, nor will history, art, English, music, political theory, gender studies, religious studies at St. Lawrence. The others, who already did the non-west, learned about current interdisciplinary theory and they learned about new cultures to include in their courses. FIPSE gave us the time to take seriously new areas of inquiry and the freedom to design a new model for intercultural study.

I would like to be able to say that the need for funding programs in cultural diversity was past, but it is not. I would especially recommend funding projects that internationalize the sciences or professions or that bring American multiculturalism into these areas.

Further Appendices:

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ST. LAWRENCE UNIVERSITY

CULTURAL ENCOUNTERS

AN INTERCULTURAL GENERAL EDUCATION CURRICULUM

LEVEL 1: CONCEIVING THE WORLD

* Thematically-organized courses center on practices or beliefs across several cultures, both Western and Non-Western
* Critical introduction to ethnocentrism and cultural relativism

LEVEL 2: CULTURAL ENCOUNTERS

* Historically -organized courses examine specific encounters between cultures, emphasizing multiplicity and cultural diffusion
*Critical introduction to hegemony, colonialism, appropriation and resistance
*Preparation for study abroad

LEVEL 3: SENIOR SEMINAR

* Theoretically-organized courses engage contemporary global issues
* Critical evaluation of cultural relativism and universalism
* Synthesis and integration of students' experiences abroad

Students opting for the Cultural Encounters Curriculum will also take:
*First-Year Program *Foreign Language *Study Abroad
*Laboratory Science *Mathematics

ST. LAWRENCE UNIVERSITY

CULTURAL ENCOUNTERS

AN INTERCULTURAL FACULTY DEVELOPMENT SEMINAR

FACULTY READING GROUP

* Three years of biweekly meetings of 17 faculty from 10 disciplines
* Reading of foundational texts from West and Non-West
* Reading of post-modern, post-colonial, and development studies

SUMMER FIELD STUDY IN KENYA

* Intensive study of Kenyan history, politics, literature, and ethnicities
* Seminars in Nairobi with Kenyan intellectuals, artists, and government officals
* Homestays throughout Kenya

SUMMER FIELD STUDY IN INDIA

* Intensive study of Indian history, politics, literature, and culture
* Seminars with Indian intellectuals and grass-roots organizations
*Homestays in Pune

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

* Collaborative development of course goals, guidelines, and pedagogies
* Providing curricular context before and after study abroad
* Special emphasis on writing, from journals to research papers

A MOTION TO THE FACULTY REGARDING CULTURAL ENCOUNTERS:

I. That Cultural Encounters pilot an alternative track of general education **for a maximum of 50 students per entering class for three entering classes, starting in 1995-96, for the Class of 1999, and continuing with the Classes of 2000 and 2001.** Students who so elect would take the following courses in order to fulfill their distribution and graduation requirements:

FYP
1 math course, preferably Statistics (otherwise one of the current distribution courses)
1 lab science
1 course in the history or philosophy of science or an additional science course
2 semesters of the same foreign language (1 may be fulfilled abroad)
Cultural Encounters I, II, III (all writing-intensive)
1 semester of study abroad

II. Courses used to serve the Cultural Encounters track would have to be approved by the Academic Affairs Committee according to the following guidelines:

There are three levels of Cultural Encounters courses. **All levels must include both "western" and "non-western" subject matter and texts. All levels must be writing intensive**. The courses are intended to promote critical reflection on what it means to study a "culture," whether that culture is one the student identifies with or one that is distant from the student's lived experience. As students move through the three courses, they should be thinking critically about both ethnocentrism and cultural relativism. In order to encourage such sustained reflection on the study of cultures, students electing the Cultural Encounters track will be asked to keep a portfolio of all the work they do in Cultural Encounters courses and abroad. As seniors, they will be required to write analyses of their own intellectual development as embodied in their portfolios.

Level One
Level I courses are comparative and topical or thematic in approach. They will generally be cross-listed with departments or programs. They study several cultures, one from the "West," focusing on a practice, institution, or dimension of human experience such as nature, death, work, gender, storytelling, healing. Students will be introduced to the concepts of ethnocentrism and cultural relativism. Each course includes cultural "texts" in the broadest sense, such as music, visual art, literature, development plans, ethnographies, house designs. Each culture is studied from multiple perspectives.

Level Two
Level II courses are organized around specific encounters between cultures, one of which must be European or North American. They will generally be cross-listed with departments or programs. Level II courses emphasize how cultures change through contact with other cultures. Students examine each culture's perception of an encounter as well as its consequences. Study of such encounters will include issues of power and

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

resistance, bilateral cultural transmission and diffusion, and multiplicity within cultural groups.

Level Three

Level III courses will not normally be cross-listed with departments because they are senior seminars meant to serve the needs of students from various majors. While they use a topic or question for their subject matter, their purpose is to help students reflect critically on how their studies, both abroad and on campus, have enlarged their perspectives and increased their knowledge about different ways of living. The students re-visit critiques of both ethnocentrism and relativism as they try to balance appreciation for difference against such normative issues as human rights. They are asked to evaluate their own positions as agents in a global political economy. Students produce a major project in the seminar, using research from their study abroad as well as library research done for the seminar.

III. An assessment of the pilot Cultural Encounters track would take place as follows:

In 1996-97, a committee of faculty outside Cultural Encounters, advised by an external consultant in program evaluation, should be convened by the Dean to design an evaluation of the program and to recommend to the Academic Affairs Committee whether and in what form it should be allowed to continue. This outside evaluation committee should consult with the Cultural Encounters Curriculum Committee in setting up the procedures for assessment. The actual evaluation should take place in 1999-2000, which will be the senior year of the second class to go through the program.

The assessment of the Cultural Encounters alternate track would examine its achievement of the following goals:

1. to provide topical and longitudinal coherence to the breadth component of a liberal arts education,

2. to provide an intellectual context for study abroad by teaching students to think critically about knowing and encountering other cultures.

The evaluation might include at least the following two types of assessment:

1. Portfolio Assessment: Analyzing a sample of the four-year portfolios submitted by students will demonstrate the kinds and rigor of the work being demanded of them as well as their skill levels. The final critical reflection they write can be used to assess how much coherence they perceived in their general education and how well they are able to deal intellectually with concepts such as ethnocentrism and cultural relativism.

2. Comparative Surveys of Students in Cultural Encounters and the Regular Distribution System: The committee could design an instrument or essay or exit interview for students who are in Cultural Encounters, not in Cultural Encounters but studied abroad, and neither in Cultural Encounters nor studied abroad.

A Rationale for Piloting an Alternative General Education Track in "Cultural Encounters"

Since the 1979 report of the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies, 'Strength through Wisdom,' U.S. colleges and universities have sought creative ways to encourage the study of languages other than English and to add international dimensions to the undergraduate curriculum. In recent years, this effort has been given a boost by requirements for the study of non-Western culture, history, geography, and politics in many undergraduate programs. In the 1980s, the principal argument for these efforts was the increasingly competitive global economy. In the 1990s, the argument is part of a larger appeal for student understanding of a multicultural society and world. ("Putting International Skills to Work," A Research Report from the U.S. Department of Education, NAFSA Newsletter Aug./Sept. 1994, 12-14)

Study abroad, language training, and foreign students notwithstanding, the heart of the matter is internationalizing the curriculum. Courses in microeconomics, literary criticism, marriage and the family, market research, historiography, botany, environmental science--offerings of the kind that constitute the basic building blocks of students' work in the traditional disciplines--should transcend all nationally and geographically limited, and limiting, frames of reference. (Joseph S. Johnston, Jr., "Internationalizing U.S. Higher Education." The Key Reporter. Summer 1994, 2-4)

Rapid change both within and beyond the borders of the United States has engaged our society in a major renegotiation of the interpretations, stories, and artistic exemplars that constitute our public and private cultures. Faculty members at colleges and universities across the United States have set themselves the task of designing curricula that broaden traditional notions of "our common cultural heritage" to incorporate the plurality of cultures around the world and, increasingly, within the United States. Scores of colleges and universities are creating, restoring, or redesigning common learning experiences for undergraduate students; in doing so, they are redefining what is central to the education of these students, whose lives and careers will span the first half of the twenty-first century. (Carole G. Scneider, "Foreward." Core Curriculum and Cultural Pluralism: A Guide for Campus Planners. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges, 1992)

Three years ago, St. Lawrence received a faculty and curriculum development grant from the Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education (FIPSE) and the Andrew Mellon Foundation. The resulting faculty seminar has run its proposed two-year course of readings and field study and will have developed and taught twelve new courses by the end of the spring 1995 semester. This year there is a new faculty seminar with about ten people continuing from the original group and ten new participants who have agreed to develop a Cultural Encounters course. The goal of the grant project was to explore the theoretical basis for a new approach to "international" or global studies, one which asks students to reflect simultaneously on the cultural traditions from which they derive their own identities and on ones from different parts of the world, i.e. the "non-west." The idea was to study other cultures from a stance that tried to avoid both ethnocentrism and relativism, that encouraged respectful, but critical, thinking about the definition of "culture" itself and about the practices and beliefs of varied peoples, including ourselves.

The curricular goal, to establish a general education track in cultural encounters for about ten percent of the students at SLU, represents an attempt to combine two needs which are being felt nationally in higher education. One is to provide a curricular context for study abroad, i.e. international education, and the other is to experiment with a form of general education markedly different from the cafeteria-style distribution system we have had for many years in different incarnations. About 33% of all SLU students spend a semester or year abroad, and many students come to SLU because of our reputation for

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

fine study abroad programs. At St. Lawrence, as at most colleges, study abroad tends to remain detached from the rest of a student's four-year education, despite its being at least one eighth of that education: "Study abroad is a marginal activity on most campuses---unencouraged, unsupported, unprepared for, and unconnected with students' work after their return. Time spent abroad too often does not entail a full engagement with the host country's culture---let alone a true immersion in it." (Joseph S. Johnston, Jr., "Internationalizing U.S. Higher Education." The Key Reporter. Summer 1994, 2-4). Some of SLU's programs are strongly tied to curricular programs, for example the language-based programs in Spain and France and the Kenya Program. But we have no systematic way of integrating study abroad with the students' major or general education. This Cultural Encounters proposal represents one way of weaving study abroad into a student's liberal education, one based in the breadth or general part of that education, rather than in a major or minor.

The most radical aspect of this project is its proposal to try a new form of general education at SLU. Currently students take the FYP, one course each in natural science, humanities, and social science, a non-western/third-world course, and two "liberal arts" courses out of three categories representing the expressive arts, foreign languages, and math. This kind of system is known as "cafeteria-style" distribution. It represents a maximum of choice to students, and aside from the FYP, there are no specific requirements. Distribution requirements are introductory courses and meant to be taken in a student's first two years, prior to his or her immersion in the major. Many view the liberal arts requirements as offering the options of "getting out of" either math or language study. Students are supposed to receive an introduction to various disciplines in the distribution courses, to encounter a culture outside the west, and to develop some skills or modes of analysis and expression in the liberal arts requirements. Most students do not reflect on why they are fulfilling these requirements, nor do they understand what they are intended to accomplish, other than sampling a variety of courses.

As a faculty we have now come to the realization that we should rethink the distribution system. While the Cultural Encounters proposed track is in no way meant to serve all students, it could serve as a pilot or experiment in a different model of general education, one that runs vertically, so to speak, through a student's four years, one that has a particular thematic or content emphasis without sacrificing breadth, one committed to intensive writing instruction throughout the four years, and one that prescribes certain courses or areas of study, i.e. math and foreign language. This proposed track, while not a one-for-one substitute for the existing requirements, accomplishes all its goals except for a purposeful introduction to three disciplines, qua disciplines. **The proposed track would include the FYP, a semester of math, one or two semesters of lab science (depending on what happens for all students, but we would be willing to pioneer the two-semester requirement), a year of foreign language, a Level I Cultural Encounters course, Level II Cultural Encounters course, semester abroad, Level III Cultural Encounters course. All three Cultural Encounters courses would be writing intensive, stressing different kinds of writing skills. The Level II course would provide students with research questions to guide them in collecting data to be used**

as the basis for a research project in the senior seminar (Level III). Students would maintain a portfolio of their Cultural Encounters writing throughout their four years. As part of the senior seminar, they would write an analysis of their intellectual development as represented in the portfolio.

Chart Showing Comparison between Current Distribution Requirements and Those for Cultural Encounters Students

Current	Cultural Encounters
First-Year Program	First-Year Program
1 Humanities Course	Cultural Encounters I
1 Social Sciences Course	Cultural Encounters II
1 Lab Science	1 Lab Science
	1 History or Philosophy of Science or another Science
1 Non-Western/Third World	Cultural Encounters III
2 of Math/Symbolic Logic, Foreign Language Arts or Forms of Expression	1 Math
	2 Semesters Foreign Language
	1 Semester Study Abroad

STAFFING

In order to make the staffing of these courses feasible, all Level I and Level II courses will be cross-listed with departments or programs, predominantly in the humanities, arts, and social sciences. It would be desirable to have Cultural Encounters courses in math and the sciences, but this does not look probable right now. Thus students will be taking disciplinary courses, but not courses designed as introductions to the disciplines per se. The only staffing burden will be the senior seminar, which cannot feasibly serve the needs of a departmental senior seminar because one could not count on the students' having the requisite disciplinary preparation. We would need a minimum of one seminar per semester every year, but three per year might be desirable if we reached the limit of fifty students per class. Students outside the Cultural Encounters track could take the Level I and Level II courses, but the seminars would have to be reserved for those in the track, or possibly students from area studies minors who have been abroad.

RATIONALE FOR LANGUAGE REQUIREMENT

We believe that if students are to learn about cultural differences, they need to engage in the study of a language other than their own. Part of the agenda of Cultural Encounters is to move students beyond ethnocentrism while not necessarily embracing cultural relativism as the alternative. Studying another language is one major way to transcend ethnocentrism. It is also part of becoming a "global citizen," of making a good faith effort to meet others on their own ground, even if one cannot fully achieve that goal.

While it would be ideal to require proficiency in a second language, that does not seem feasible in a general education program. Therefore we want to mandate that Cultural Encounters students take one year of a language, at the level appropriate to their previous training. They can count language studied abroad, but only if they study the particular language for a year. Thus students going to Denmark and India will not be able to count their language study there unless they somehow find another course in Danish or Hindi in a summer school program. Because one of our goals is to get students to appreciate the role language plays in shaping perception and subjectivity, we have considered the possibility that students who go to India and Denmark could fill the language requirement by taking a course such as Language and Experience in addition to the semester of Hindi or Danish. Alternatively, we could require them to take a year of a different language.

RATIONALE FOR MATH AND SCIENCE REQUIREMENTS

The Cultural Encounters curriculum seeks to provide a course of study that is defined by its global and intercultural focus. The role of mathematics and science in this track may be viewed as problematic. Many practitioners of these disciplines consider it part of their beauty that they seem to transcend cultural differences, to provide a universal methodology that spans nations and ethnicities. The more minimalist rationale for the place of math and science within Cultural Encounters would simply be that students need scientific literacy and mathematical skills as part of a liberal arts education, and we want to mandate that students take the necessary courses for achieving these rather than electing to take a language instead of math. We believe that Statistics would be the most relevant math course because it helps to educate students to evaluate information critically, as global citizens need to be able to do if they are to make responsible choices.

The more maximal rationale for the study of science is that modern western culture is heavily defined by its reliance on scientific methodology and the technologies that result from it. If students are going to engage in cross-cultural study, "non-scientific" beliefs about health and curing and agriculture, to name a few examples, are bound to arise. In order to confront fully the differences and similarities among various cultures, they need a clear idea of what science allows and disallows, what it offers and what it takes away from life. Ideally students would take one lab science which teaches them how to practice certain scientific procedures and then they would take one course which contextualizes western science historically. Should the science faculty develop new introductory courses which provide some explicit reflection on what constitutes science, those would be ideal for the program.

SIGNING UP AND DROPPING OUT:

Students would be told about the Cultural Encounters option during First-Year advising. They could sign up at any time during their first three semesters, as long as the track was not filled up with 50 students. The Director of International Education would be responsible for signing them up and advising them. Should it become evident that a

student who had signed up was not going to be able to study abroad for any reason, he or she would have to switch back to the regular distribution system. Since most of the courses in the Cultural Encounters track also satisfy the current distribution system, this should not cause too much difficulty. We would ask that a student who had taken Cultural Encounters I and II be given credit for the Non-Western requirement. He or she would at worst have to make up the Humanities and Social Science courses.

It is not often that a group of diverse faculty from disciplines spanning the curriculum spends the kind of time and energy on conceptualizing a curriculum that the Cultural Encounters participants have done. With this year's group, twenty-five faculty members will have participated in reading about cultures, discussing interculturalism, and developing guidelines for a series of courses. The seminars have been marked with conflict, not unanimity. But we have developed a set of common problems, questions, and pedagogies that define a unique approach to global studies. We ask the faculty to consider seriously the contribution this curriculum can make to the breadth side of a St. Lawrence education. It has the potential to offer a coherent path to students who come here interested in international study. It will appeal only to those students who seek challenges because it is more demanding than the current distribution system and more prescriptive. But we hope it can offer us as a faculty some new ways of thinking about general education as we reformulate the entire system.

CULTURAL ENCOUNTERS
CURRICULAR GUIDELINES

As part of the Cultural Encounters Program, all courses will have certain common commitments. They will all include content from cultures commonly understood as "Western" and "non-Western," though part of the project may be to challenge or replace these categories. The assumption is that we can study other cultures most fairly if we simultaneously reflect on our own. Moreover, we should encounter other cultures in their own voices, and not solely through the lenses of Western scholarship, though again this is a distinction that can be critically engaged in the classroom. These courses will also place the political implications of "knowing the other" in the foreground for discussion.

We also intend to develop "writing-intensive" pedagogies through consultation with the University Writing Committee, and to explore ways in which journals can be used to connect the students' personal experiences with the academic content of the program, particularly in relation to study abroad.

LEVEL I - CONCEIVING THE WORLD

Level I :Goals

1) Students should learn to examine and interpret practices in particular cultures, one of which will be a Western culture.
2) Students should begin to examine their own culture as they explore others.
3) Students should begin to recognize and challenge ethnocentrism, denaturalize the West as the primary standard of culture normalcy, and explore how cultural practices are socially constructed.
4) Students should be introduced to a vocabulary of cultural relativism, examining its meaning, its implications, and its limitations.

Level I: Common Theoretical Questions

1) How can we begin to understand the cultural practices of ourselves and others? How do we interpret cultural practices? How does the role of the observer condition what is observed?
2) Can one understand cultural practices without judging their merits? Is this stance morally and politically adequate?
3) What does it mean to talk about the "social construction of culture"?
4) How have the practices under consideration been affected by politics and history?

Level I: Pedagogy

Level I courses will study three particular cultures, one from the West, focusing on an area or practice that can be considered in many cultures, such as beauty, work, family, nature. Every

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

course should include cultural texts such as music, visual art, literature, medical treatises, development plans and /or ethnographies. Multiple perspectives of the cultures being studied should be examined, including voices from within the culture.

The classes should be conducted in seminar format in order to encourage open discussion and exchange of ideas. Although these courses can be cross-listed with departments, the instructor(s) should approach the course from interdisciplinary perspectives. When possible, instructors should seek help from faculty in other disciplines to design and teach these courses. Consideration of questions for study abroad should begin at this level.

LEVEL II - CULTURAL ENCOUNTERS

Level II:Goals

1) Students should study of the evolution of cultures over time through the examination of specific cultural encounters between cultures, with emphasis on appropriations, cross-fertilizations, and resistance. At least one culture will be from a Euro-American tradition.
2) Students should examine the encounters, perceptions of those encounters from each culture, and the impact and consequences of the encounters on each culture.
3) The courses at this level should build on and reflect subject matter and theoretical debates introduced in the Level I courses. Students should continue to develop a theoretical sophistication in studying and talking about cultures. Important concepts include hegemony, colonialism, appropriation, diffusion and relativism. Also, the concept of culture should be examined as complex, contested, and historically evolving.
4) Students should refine their preparation for their study abroad.

Level II: Common Theoretical Questions

1) How do you trace cultural influences? How do you see through a cultural practice to its multiple origins? The emphasis here is on developing an understanding the multi-directional transmission of culture. How are ideas, practices, artifacts mutually appropriated and absorbed?
2) What are the dynamics of power in cultural encounters? What forms do domination, subjugation, and resistance take? Who are the groups involved in these encounters? What are the multiple positions of power held by these groups?
3) What are the immediate and long-term consequences -- political, aesthetic, social, spiritual-- of the encounters for each culture involved?
4)What are the theoretical debates concerning colonialism and post-colonialism? How are the legacies of colonialism played out in the subsequent histories of the colonized and the colonizers?

Level II: Pedagogy

The context of the study must allow voices from both cultures in the encounter to emerge; the study must also examine the multiple and conflicting voices from within each culture. These courses should pay explicit attention to preparing students for study abroad.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

LEVEL III - PROGRAM SEMINAR

Level III :Goals

1) These seminars should provide a forum for students to reflect on and integrate their study abroad experiences with the coursework they have done over the preceding three years.
2) In these seminars students should reflect critically on the ways in which their studies and experiences have enlarged their perspectives and increased their capacities for appreciation of different ways of living, without losing sight of the nexus of power relations within which all cultural encounters transpire, and their own positions within that nexus.
3) In these seminars students should reflect critically on their own emerging ethical, political and aesthetic commitments. The point of this reflection is not to steer students toward any particular beliefs or values, but to help them understand the genealogies and implications of the commitments they espouse.

Level III: Common Theoretical Questions

Rather than share a range of common theoretical questions, each seminar may want to choose one or more from the following list and pursue it/them in depth.

1) Is it possible to articulate a responsible ethical position that is neither ethnocentric nor relativist? What would it look like?
2) What would a reasonable human rights position look like that is not ethnocentric?
3) Are there any universal elements across cultures?
4) How should we balance human needs and desires against the welfare of non-human elements of the earth?
5) What is the relationship between one's specific identities (gender, ethnicity, etc.) and one's participation in larger polities, whether regional, national, or global? (how do the issues of American pluralism relate to those of international or global interculturalism?)

Level III: Pedagogy

This will be run as a seminar, with little or no lecturing and substantial responsibility for the course given to students. They will do projects, using data from their study abroad as well as library research done during the course. The journals written on and about their study abroad should play a central role in their projects. Ideally their projects will be more than academic exercises; they will require students to use their experience and research to articulate a position on one of the theoretical questions listed above. In-class presentations which juxtapose a wide variety of experiences from abroad should enrich and complicate the individual's interpretation of her/his own experience, as should readings, films, etc.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ST. LAWRENCE UNIVERSITY

CULTURAL ENCOUNTERS PILOT COURSES

Cultural Encounters courses are part of a grant project aimed at developing a curriculum to both prepare students for study abroad and reflect on issues in intercultural experience raised by living in a society other than one's own. The courses focus on the multiplicity within cultures and the ways cultures interact and influence each other. The Level I and Level II courses introduce questions and concepts related to encountering cultures. The Level III course is a seminar designed to help students make use of what they have experienced through study abroad.

African Studies and Anthropology 248A: Environmental Perception and Indigenous Knowledge. Cultural Encounters Level I. Celia Nyamweru, Associate Professor of Anthropology.
The course aims to look at the ways in which different non-western, non-industrial cultures perceive their world, in particular the phenomena of the physical environment and the relationships of human beings to these phenomena. Topics to be covered may include: (1) People and land; recognition of different landscapes and resources; allocation of rights to the land and its produce; the concept of soil fertility and the need to conserve it. (2) People and vegetation; use of plants and the allocation of rights to plant produce; conservation of vegetation. (3) People and animals, both wild and domestic; how do different cultures see competition and/or co-operation between humans and animals; the history of domestication, the rights and duties of hunters. (4) Human reactions to natural hazards; the physical environment as risk and threat, and how different cultures interpret and cope with this. This course will be illustrated with numerous regional examples and case studies, drawn largely though not exclusively from different African ethnic groups.

Economics 248 SPTP: African Economies. Cultural Encounters Level I. Robert Blewett, Associate Professor of Economics.
An overview of Sub-Saharan African economies. The course will analyze not only current development and structural adjustment issues, but also examine basic economic principles, problems and indigenous institutions within an African context. Contrasts and comparisons with North American counterparts will be made throughout the course. Special emphasis will be placed on exploring how cultural differences impact economic activities and institutions. Students will learn not only of the diversity and complexity of economic relationships in African societies but will increase their understanding of economics in their own society. **Cross-listed with African Studies (AFS 248) and Cultural Encounters.** ***Prerequisite: Economics 101 or 102.***

English 274: Introduction to Caribbean Culture. Cultural Encounters Level I. Olive Senior, Visiting Distinguished Dana Professor of International Writing.
An introduction, by a Caribbean author, to one of the world's most diverse cultures, using literary texts supplemented by films and music. The course will examine the European, African & Asian presences in the region's literary tradition and explore how various authors over time have dealt with issues of race, ethnicity, gender, and cultural identity. This pan-Caribbean approach will include authors from the English-speaking Caribbean as well as texts in translation from the Spanish-and French-speaking islands. **Crosslisted with CLAS and Cultural Encounters.**

Literature in Translation 222: Introduction to International Literature. Cultural Encounters Level I. Patricia Alden, Professor of English, and Roy Caldwell, Associate Professor of French.
This course will be organized both by genre and by cultural zones. The two genres are the epic and the novel; the four areas of culture are Europe, Latin America, Africa, India. From each of these four zones one epic and one novel will be read. The novels represent a highly self-conscious act of depicting cultures both in transition and in conflict with other cultures. The course will thus address "conceiving the world" in three ways: by contrasting modern and ancient world views, by comparing the generic complications of the novel and epic, and by comparing and contrasting the four cultures represented by the texts. **Crosslisted with English 222.**

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ND 247: Cultural Constructions of the Female Body and Sexuality. Cultural Encounters Level I. Eve Stoddard, Director of International Education and Associate Professor of English.
This course focuses on the ways femininity, or womanhood, is constructed in contemporary mainstream America, several African societies, and several contemporary Muslim societies. Specifically, the course will focus on beauty practices in the U.S., including plastic surgery, dieting, and exercising; female circumcision in various Africa and European contexts, and the wearing of the veil by Muslim women. In each case these practices will be examined in light of the pressures created by recent historical movements such as feminism and post-colonial independence. Each practice will also be encountered through multiple perspectives from within the relevant culture.

English 252: Global Shakespeare: Intercultural Appropriations. Cultural Encounters Level II. Thomas L. Berger, Dana Professor of English.
Universal genius or not, Shakespeare appears to be the ultimate cultural icon. His works are approved, performed, taught, edited, studied, translated, debated, discussed, dismissed, disliked intensely, and loved intemperately all over the world. Shakespeare is, simply, culture with a capital CULTURE. As each culture encounters and re-encounters Shakespeare, that culture must reshape Shakespeare to meet its own needs. Productions of Shakespeare in various cultural contexts say at least as much about those cultural contexts as they do about Shakespeare. Often they reflect the dominant ideologies of a particular culture; at other times they constitute not very subtle critiques of the dominant ideology. At the same time, however, intercultural appropriations of Shakespeare often provide valuable new perspectives on Shakespeare's art as art. This course will examine a number of Shakespeare's plays as they have appeared in a variety of cultural contexts: African, American, Caribbean, British, German, Indian, Italian, Japanese, and Spanish. Listening for Shakespeare's voice and the voice(s) of particular cultures, students will read selected plays, view and review videotaped productions, read and report on intercultural productions, and discuss the uses to which certain cultures put the works of this late sixteenth-, early seventeenth-century English playwright.

CLAS / Music 248: Cultural Encounters In the Americas: The U.S. and Puerto Rico. Cultural Encounters Level II. Laura O'Shaughnessy, Dana Professor of Government, and Michael Farley, Assistant Professor of Music.
An examination of popular music in the U.S. and Puerto Rico reveals the bitter conflicts and enormously successful syntheses which resulted from the clash of three cultures--those of Spain, the rest of Western Europe and West Africa--in the Americas. As a part of this study, we will carefully consider the methodology which we use to analyze other cultures and historical periods. For example, how do we draw meaning from music which is not our own? How could we go about tracing aspects of other cultures in the music of the Americas? Is it possible, or desirable, to avoid predispositions as we attempt to understand the politics of another period or culture? We will focus upon the Reconstruction Period (ca. 1865) and the Great Depression (ca. 1929) in the U.S., and the past 40 years in Puerto Rico. A research project will require students to examine a culture through a study of its music, its economics and its political pressures.

English 274 SPTP: Innocents Abroad: Americans in Europe. Cultural Encounters Level II. Leopoldo Mateo, Visiting Professor of Spanish.
The course will study the way Europe has caught American imagination. From the gothic stereotypes of E.A. Poe to the novels of expatriates like Henry James and Edith Wharton and travellers like Hemingway, Fitzgerald and Mark Twain, the course will offer a sample of the way Europe has been treated by American writers in different works of fiction and travel writings. We will give more emphasis to countries in Southern Europe like Spain, Italy, France and Greece. We will also use films like the recently released "Barcelona." **Cross-listed with LTRN 248.**

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

English 347 SPTP: Ethnic American Writers and Their Origins: Cultural Encounters Level II. Susan Ward, Professor of English.
This course will focus on the literature of three out of four major American ethnic groups: African Americans, Asian Americans, Latin Americans, and Native Americans. In addition to considering work by writers born in the United States, the course will also consider literature produced in the regions and/or time periods to which the individual groups can trace their origins, e.g. Africa, Asia, Latin America, and the pre-Columbian U.S. Topics to be discussed will include national or regional identities or themes before contact with American culture, cultural and literary experience, etc. Along with writers from the cultures of origin, we will read ethnic American writers such as Toni Morrison, Ralph Ellison, James Welch, Louise Erdrich, Maxine Hong Kingston, and Frank Chin.

Fine Arts 220 : The Museum as Cultural Crossroads. Cultural Encounters Level II. Dorothy Limouze, Assistant Professor of Fine Arts.
This course explores the museum as a largely western phenomenon, and as a lens through which the western world views other cultures. Readings and class discussions will consider such topics as the origins and evolution of the concept of a museum, the growth of museums in the eras of colonial empires and superpowers, the politics of collection and public display, the role of museums in constructing and mediating cultural "otherness", and the museum as redefined by post-colonial and postmodern thought. This course is therefore not a "training course" or practicum for the museum profession, but rather a critique of the institution that will familiarize students both with its history and with contemporary critical appraisals.

Religious Studies 248N: Fundamentalism as Cultural Encounter. Cultural Encounters Level II. Thomas B. Coburn, Dana Professor of Religious Studies and Classical Languages.
The word "fundamentalism" was coined in the United States in the early twentieth century to describe a certain kind of Christianity that was opposed to "modernism" in religion. It was opposed, in particular, to Darwinian theories of evolution and favored literal reading of the Bible. In the 1950s the term became applied more broadly to apparently similar tendencies in other religious traditions, particularly Islam. Today it is used widely and often uncritically to identify movements among Hindus, Muslims, and Jews, as well as Christians. It is often thought to overlap with religious nationalism or with religious enthusiasm generally. This seminar will test a recent hypothesis which suggests that fundamentalism is a particular, generic kind of religiousness that represents a "revolt against the modern age." This will involve two interrelated tasks: (1) exploring the usefulness of the concept "fundamentalism" as a comparative category and (2) becoming familiar with the dynamics of cultural and social change in a variety of settings including, but not limited to, modern India, the Islamic world, and North America.

ND 448 Cultural Encounters Senior Seminar: Cross-Cultural Perspectives of Healing. Cultural Encounters Level III. David Hornung, Dana Professor of Biology, and Catherine Shrady, Assistant Professor of Geology.
Around the world many alternatives exist to Western allopathic medicine. This course will explore the philosophical, practical, and medical definitions of health and disease from a number of western and non-western traditions. The course will begin with the Hippocratic tradition, go through Western theories of health and disease, and then consider non-western approaches to health and disease. For example, The Islamic Code of Medical Ethics, The Oath of a Muslim Physician, the Oath of Initiation (from the Caraka Samhita), medical ethics in ancient China, and the 17 Rules of Enjuin will all be discussed as they relate to their appropriate medical traditions. We will discuss how the principals described in these readings apply to questions of beneficence, promise keeping, autonomy, killing and prolonging life, and the healer/patient relationship within the various medical traditions. **Preference to students who have taken one Cultural Encounters course or participated in a study abroad program. Class size: limited to 16.**

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

DISTRIBUTION AND GRADUATION REQUIREMENTS

To graduate from St. Lawrence a student must complete a number of requirements. All students will declare a major at the end of the sophomore year. In addition to the major, students must complete a series of courses designed to provide breadth. There are two distinct plans available to students for achieving breadth. **Both options include the FYP.**

OPTION 1: Most students will fulfill **the standard system of distribution and graduation requirements.** This curriculum allows students to choose subject matter and skills from a wide range of fields, according to their individual interests, as described below.

I. Distribution Requirements
Students will take one course in each of three areas: Natural Sciences, Social Sciences, and Humanities. The course taken in the Natural Science category must have a laboratory.

II. Graduation Requirement in Non-Western and Third-World Studies
Students must complete at least one course dealing with non-Western or Third-World topics.

III. Graduation Requirement in Liberal Arts
Students must complete at least two courses from the classical liberal arts, with at least one course from two of the following areas: Mathematics or Symbolic Logic, Arts or Forms of Expression, and Foreign Languages.

OPTION 2: Students interested in international studies or multiculturalism may choose to pursue the **Cultural Encounters Track. This alternative curriculum lays out a sequence of courses which provide for a broad, liberal education with a focus on interaction between cultures currently and throughout history. This sequence, which includes foreign language study and study abroad, is meant to provide a coherent, rigorous, global context for students' majors.**

I. Cultural Encounters Core Courses
Students must take three courses in the Cultural Encounters sequence. Levels I and II need to be taken before studying abroad. Level III is a senior seminar. Cultural Encounters core courses are all writing intensive.

II. Foreign Language Study and Study Abroad
Students pursuing the Cultural Encounters track must spend at least one semester on one of St. Lawrence's abroad programs. Students must take at least two semesters of a foreign language, one of which may be taken in their abroad program.

III. Science and Mathematics
Students must take one semester of mathematics, preferably statistics. They must take two semesters of a laboratory science or one semester of a laboratory science and an additional course in the history or philosophy of science.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

OPTION 1: STANDARD CURRICULUM	OPTION 2: CULTURAL ENCOUNTERS CURRICULUM
First-Year Program	First-Year Program
1 Humanities Course	Cultural Encounters I
1 Social Sciences Course	Cultural Encounters II
1 Lab Science	1 Lab Science
	1 History or Philosophy of Science or another Lab Science
1 Non-Western/Third World	Cultural Encounters III
2 of Math/Symbolic Logic, Foreign Language Arts or Forms of Expression	1 Math
	2 Semesters Foreign Language
	1 Semester Study Abroad

Potential Questions about Cultural Encounters

Since the Cultural Encounters track is a new option for the class entering SLU in fall 1995, everyone will have questions about how it is going to work. The following is a list of common questions and answers. Further questions about Cultural Encounters should be directed to the Director of International Education. There will be a session on Cultural Encounters and Intercultural Studies during Orientation for all interested first-year students.

1. When do you sign up? Students can sign up anytime during their first three semesters. If a student is considering CE, s/he would do well to take courses which satisfy both tracks while making up her/his mind. These would be lab science, math, and foreign language. If we near the fifty student quota, students will be notified.

2. How do you sign up? Students sign up in the International Education Office in Carnegie. The Director of International Education, or another faculty member designated by her, will help advise the student through the CE curriculum.

3. What if more than fifty students want to participate? This is unlikely in the first year, but if the quota starts to fill up all first-year students will be notified and given a chance to apply through a brief essay.

4. How is Cultural Encounters different from the regular distribution system and is it harder or easier? While they both offer breadth and the opportunity to sample courses in a spectrum of disciplines, the CE option differs in many ways from the standard system. The CE option has a central, coherent focus on global and crosscultural study. A student who graduates with Cultural Encounters on her/his transcript will be able to present him or herself as one prepared to work with and live with persons of diverse cultural backgrounds, someone who has done at least some language study and lived abroad. But to achieve this distinction, CE students have to meet more requirements than other students do. They take an additional science course and both language and math, rather than one or the other. Also, the CE curriculum runs through all four years, culminating in a senior capstone seminar which will ask students to reflect critically upon their experiences abroad and the rest of their education.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Finally the CE courses are writing intensive; all three will ask students to write frequently and to use writing as a means of analyzing and reflecting on their studies of cultures, both their own and others.

5. Are Cultural Encounters students automatically accepted to abroad programs? No. CE students will go through the same application process and meet the same standards as other students. Thus a CE student on disciplinary probation will not be allowed to apply. However, one would expect that CE students would present extremely strong profiles because of their coursework and their commitment to the study of cultures.

6. What happens if a student in Cultural Encounters is rejected from all the abroad programs s/he applies to? Then s/he will not be able to complete the CE requirements and will have to transfer into the normal distribution system.

7. What happens if a student wants or needs to switch out of Cultural Encounters? The math, science, and language requirements for CE also satisfy the normal distribution requirements, so these would transfer. If the student had taken CE Levels I and II, s/he would have satisfied the Nonwestern requirement. If s/he had taken only one CE course, it might satisfy the Nonwestern or Humanities or Social Science requirement, depending on the specific course. This would have to be worked out on a case by case basis.

8. Can science students participate? As with going abroad, science majors and pre-health students need to plan very carefully starting from their first semester. The extra science requirement and math requirement should not present a problem. The main issue will be when and where to go abroad. Biology courses are available in Denmark, Costa Rica, at Fisk University, and potentially in France and through ISEP. Chemistry is available at Lancaster University in England, Fisk University, and potentially in France and through ISEP. Environmental Studies courses are available in Denmark, Spain, Vienna, and Kenya.

9. What counts for the language requirement? Students must take two semesters of the same language at the appropriate level for their background. They cannot test out of this requirement. One semester must be taken on campus; we offer Russian, German, Japanese, KiSwahili, French, and Spanish. Students going to Denmark and India will not be able to take Danish or Hindi on campus, so they will either have to study another language or find a summer school program on another campus. Program specific language pre-requisites are as follows: France and Spain: completion of 200 level courses; Costa Rica: equivalent of two years of college Spanish (through 104); Russia: advanced level Russian; Vienna: 1 semester German; Japan/ICU: 1 year Japanese; Japan/Nanzan: 2 years Japanese. ISEP universities are around the world and require that students can attend classes in the local language.

10. Will this affect a student's major? CE does not compete with a student's major; rather it is meant to provide a global context for any major. In the senior seminar, students should be able to pursue a research project which ties in with their major interests.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CULTURAL ENCOUNTERS REGISTRATION FORM

Student's Name_____ **Class**_____

CMR#_____

Academic Advisor's Name_____

Date of Enrollment in Cultural Encounters Track_____

GPA_____

Cultural Encounters Requirements

FYP
CE Level I
CE Level II
CE Level III
Foreign Language 2 Semesters
Lab Science 1
Science 2
Math
Study Abroad

I understand that the Cultural Encounters Track requires me to participate in an abroad program for at least one semester, and that I will have to transfer out of Cultural Encounters if I become ineligible to study abroad because of a low GPA, Disciplinary Probation, or any other reason. I also understand that I will need to keep a Portfolio of all the work I do in CE courses and on my abroad program.

Signature of Student_____

Signature of Academic Advisor_____

Signature of Director of International Education_____

Please return one copy of this to the International Education Office, and keep one for yourself.